

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment is being submitted as a supplement to the Request for Continued Examination, filed June 15, 2007, in accordance with the Examiners' suggestions made during the personal interview held on June 27, 2007 between Examiner Coughlan, Supervisory Patent Examiner Vincent and Applicants' representative, Mr. Metjahic. Upon entry of the present Amendment, including the amendments made herein, claims 1-4, 9-14, 19-21 and 23-24 will be pending, of which claims 1 and 19 will have been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein, without limiting the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants submit that the amendments should not be construed as admissions to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 1-4, 9-14, 19-21 and 23-24 are now in condition for allowance.

Initially, Applicants express their appreciation to Examiner Coughlan and Supervisory Patent Examiner Vincent for conducting a personal interview with their representative, Mr. Safet Metjahic, on June 27, 2007. During the interview, the Examiners and Mr. Metjahic discussed the merits of the Final Official Action, mailed March 15, 2007, as well as the Advisory Official Action, mailed June 1, 2007. Mr. Metjahic respectfully submitted that the currently pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and in particular, over the nine separate U.S. patents that were relied on by the Examiner in the rejections set forth in the Final Official Action, including MASAND et al., WHITE, et al., MIZUNO, ALAM, GLIER, SALGADO, REGISTER, TAN and/or TAN2. Mr. Metjahic explained that any proper combination of the teachings of the cited documents would not teach or suggest, for example, a

classifier that processes documents in one of a knowledge acquisition mode or a document classification mode, and outputs a predicted classification and a confidence value on an individual document basis, much less where the classifier is switchable between the modes for each document based on user input. Mr. Metjahic further explained that any proper combination of the cited art would not teach or suggest, for example, a threshold that is adjustable to match a desired confidence value to allow transition from a state where manual routing is favored to a state that favors automatic routing. Moreover, Mr. Metjahic explained how the cited documents taught away from Applicants' invention and the Examiner's suggested combinations.

The Examiners agreed to reconsider the cited art and the patentability of each of the pending claims. The Examiners did, however, request that Applicants provide an explicit reference to the Specification that provides a description of the adjustable threshold element in, for example, independent claims 1 and 19. The Examiners also requested that Applicants amend, for example, the terms "arranged to" and "operable" in each of independent claims 1 and 19. Accordingly, Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1 and 19, as suggested by the Examiners, without limiting the scope of protection, and submit that support for the adjustable threshold element of claims 1 and 19 may be found, for example, at page 4, lines 5-11 of Applicants' Specification. Thus, Applicants believe that independent claims 1 and 19 are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 set forth in the Official Action dated March 15, 2007.

Further, since claims 2-4, 9-14, 20-21 and 23-24 depend from claims 1 and 19, and are patentably distinguishable for at least the reasons provided with respect to claims 1 and 19, as well as for the reasons provided in the Request for Continued Examination, filed June 15, 2007, which are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety, and for additional reasons related to their own recitations, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4, 9-14, 20-21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103 set forth in the Official Action dated March 15, 2007.

Thus, Applicants believe that claims 1-4, 9-14, 19-21 and 23-24 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and an indication of the allowability of claims 1-4, 9-14, 19-21 and 23-24 in the next Official communication.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, including the Applicants' remarks made in the Request for Continued Examination, which are herein incorporated in their entirety by reference, it is submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in the Final Official Action dated March 15, 2007, should be withdrawn. The present Amendment is in proper form, and none of the references teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request timely allowance of the present application.

Applicants note that this Amendment is being made at the suggestion of the Examiners during the personal interview of June 27, 2007, in order to advance the prosecution of the application to allowance. Applicants do not acquiesce as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections by the present Amendment.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should there be any questions regarding this paper or the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ah Hwee TAN et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

July 5, 2007  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

Steven Wegman  
Reg. No. 31,438